

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

14421

However, Senator PROXMIER is obviously driven by compulsions other than the desire to "keep in touch" with the folks back home. Wisconsin's voters are full of surprises for favored candidates. The State went for Dewey in 1944, Truman in 1948, Nixon in 1960. In addition, Wisconsin has a nominal GOP majority. Of 32 daily newspapers, 28 are solidly Republican and 4 are independent. In short, Wisconsin is not a sure bet for anybody, especially Democrats.

IT'S ROUGH FOR DEMOCRATS

The sledding is particularly rough for Democrats when the Republicans offer a strong candidate, which they rarely do. Wisconsin Republicans, like lemmings, appear to be seized by a quadrennial death wish, and when election time rolls around they tend to offer up candidates of no visible qualifications. This year, however, Mr. PROXMIER's likely opponent will be a man he respects greatly—former Lt. Gov. Warren Knowles, an affable gentleman whose name is well known throughout the State.

Mr. PROXMIER has still another reason for his repeated trips to Wisconsin. It is probably not the most important reason, but in many ways it's the most interesting, partly because it tells a great deal about the Senator himself. As he put it last week:

"These sessions at home not only give me a chance to meet them but it also gives them a chance to get to know me. I am not a bundle of conditioned reflexes who automatically votes the party line. I sometimes go the other way. However, if they think of me as just another Democrat they will always be surprised—even outraged—when I do something else. But if they know me, they'll be able to understand what I do. The trust of my constituents gives me an unusual degree of independence."

DISMAYS THE LIBERALS

Mr. PROXMIER's "independence" constantly dismays Democratic liberals who demand complete conformity to the administration's program. In 1960, for example, the Americans for Democratic Action's annual voting index awarded Mr. PROXMIER a 100-percent proliberal rating. By 1962, however, Mr. PROXMIER's liberal rating had dropped to 66 percent. He has broken with the administration on, among other things, the standby public works program, the distribution of farm surpluses to Poland and Yugoslavia, and a succession of farm bills.

His independence is most noticeable, however, on economic issues. He is almost alone among northern Democrats in opposing the administration's tax program. He believes it would deepen the Federal budget deficit and lead inevitably to inflation.

In a report on the President's tax program by the Joint Economic Committee, of which he is a member, Mr. PROXMIER dissented from the position taken by his Democratic colleagues:

"The preeminent economic success of America has been based on individual self-reliance, with minimum Government participation and maximum individual freedom and incentive. * * * All of this suggests that the right prescription should indeed be a tax cut to free the economy's productive forces from the burden of Government taxes. But unless Federal spending is reduced—at least to keep pace with the reduction in Federal taxes—the reduced burden is a mirage." It is a mirage, he argued, because a tax cut without commensurate reductions in Federal spending will simply expand the supply of available money, increase demand, and cause a rise in prices. "The taxpayer's after-tax income may be higher," he argues. "But his income buys no more."

Since Mr. PROXMIER's notions run directly counter to the administration's belief that a deliberately induced budget deficit is necessary for an expanding economy, his Democratic colleagues spend a lot of time trying

to figure out where Mr. PROXMIER "went wrong." Says one:

"Bill simply didn't get a full exposure to Keynes (British economist who provided the intellectual underpinnings for the theory of deficit spending to boost a nation's economy). He got out of Yale in 1938, and then went to Harvard Business School. I'm certain that he didn't learn anything about Keynes in either place. He just doesn't seem familiar with modern doctrine."

Mr. PROXMIER retorts that he is well aware of Keynesian economics. He got a full dose of it when, at Harvard after the war, he received an M.A. in government and economics. He simply believes that Mr. Kennedy's economists are misusing Keynes.

"The idea was always to use deficit spending—pump-priming, if you will—during a recession or economic downturn. But now they are telling us that we've got to use it even when the economy is going up—and keep using it until we reach a specific but highly arbitrary 'rate of growth.'"

A PRAIRIE LIBERALISM

It would be a mistake, however, to think that Mr. PROXMIER's economic views are as conservative as, say, Senator HARRY BYRAN's. For example, his monetary views, which call for a general lowering of interest rates and easing of credit, have a prairie liberalism reminiscent of populism.

Nor is he opposed to all Government spending. He opposes what he views as non-productive Government spending—that which exercises a drag on the economy. He estimates that in any given year there is \$5 billion to \$6 billion of such wasted spending. But he supports what he calls productive Government spending—that which helps a free economy or strengthens its long-term resources, such as vocational education manpower retraining, industrial research grants, aid to education. He also takes orthodox liberal views on civil rights, the test ban treaty, foreign aid, and medical care for the aged, all of which he supports.

HIS VIEWS ARE "ON THE BUTTON"

"Bills economic views are pretty much on the button," says an ex aid. "He's one of the few Northern Senators to realize that the Nation's rank and file are not half so liberal as the liberals would like to think."

But the Senator himself does not claim to be an infallible judge of Wisconsin's moods, nor is he always certain—public opinion polls to the contrary—exactly what his voters are thinking. That's why, the other day, he was preparing once again to leave Washington and return home for the weekend.

WIFE SELLS A STORY

"My wife," he said as he was about to leave his office, "has just sold a story to Redbook magazine called 'One Foot in Washington.' Well, you've got to keep one foot in Washington. But that's enough. You keep the other one in Wisconsin."

He waved goodbye and closed the door behind him. In 2 seconds the door flew open, and Mr. PROXMIER reappeared.

"Of course," he said, "my opponents will no doubt accuse me of keeping at least one foot in my mouth."

He flashed his athletic grin, bounded out the door, and was gone. Back for another 2,700 handshakes.

THE DEFENSE BUDGET

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a few days ago the able junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] made a penetrating speech on the question of the defense budget and the possibility of making reductions in that budget. I hope that this speech will receive the attention it deserves as we move forward in

connection with the defense appropriation bill.

Mr. Edward P. Morgan, in one of his evening broadcasts for the American Broadcasting Co., commented most favorably on the speech by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN]. In the thought that many readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD did not have an opportunity to hear Mr. Morgan, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the broadcast may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The junior Senator from South Dakota, GEORGE MCGOVERN, has thrown right into the middle of the test ban treaty discussions a related but politically perhaps an even more complicated issue: the size of our defense budget. A former college professor with more than an academic sense of history—he flew 35 missions against the Nazis as a bomber pilot in World War II—MCGOVERN is a loyal New Frontiersman; he once headed President Kennedy's food for peace program. But he thinks the military budget is too high because it is adding nuclear warheads to an arsenal which already contains far more weapons than we ever would or could use even in "total" war.

After a long and careful personal study of the problem, Senator MCGOVERN proposed in a major floor speech today selective cuts in expenditures for warheads which would total \$5 billion. He would divert this respectable nest egg of savings to peaceful purposes to strengthen the economy and enrich the fabric of American society.

The Senator's formula was inspired, in part, by a study of U.S. strategy made by a group of educators headed by Seymour Melman, professor of industrial engineering at Columbia University. This study has caused something of a flurry in official Washington since it was released 3 months ago because it harps on a controversial concept which strikes at the established pattern of Pentagon planning. In a nutshell, Melman argues, with almost evangelical zeal, that in building up our defenses we have reached, and then proceeded to ignore, a new military condition which the brass calls "overkill." This means that in accumulating between them nuclear weapons with an explosive power of 60 billion tons of TNT, the United States and the Soviet Union are now capable of killing off each other's population not just once but scores of times over. Indeed that 60-billion figure provides enough nuclear dynamite to aim a 10-ton bomb at the head of every human being on the planet.

Melman contends that without moving an inch toward disarmament it is possible to cut between \$22 and \$23 billion out of the \$56.7 billion defense budget and still not weaken national security because the cuts are mostly in the redundancy of nuclear weapons. He would divert this whole huge basket of savings into industrial productivity which he maintains, with some impressive conviction, is being starved by the greediness of military demands robbing the civilian economy of the vitamins of proper industrial growth.

Some responsible Government officials who have studied Melman's plan insist that he has grossly oversimplified the problem; that he hasn't, for example, taken into proper account the additional missiles that might be needed to knock out Soviet missile bases which are now being hardened. Even Defense officials concede, however, that for at least 2 years we have had tens or hundreds of times more nuclear weapons than we would ever use in an all-out war.

14422

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 15

Senator McGovern didn't think Melman could safely justify his colossal cuts but he and several other Members of Congress have been impressed with the professor's basic argument. However, when McGovern and Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin, went personally to the Pentagon recently to ask how much actual overkill capacity we already had, they found the going rough. They didn't get the run-around, exactly, but nobody seemed to know the answer. This may have been in part because the Defense Department has dropped the term "conventional weapon" and substituted "general purpose," in the budget. But more and more this classification is coming to cover nuclear weapons for tactical use.

Nevertheless, McGovern concluded Congress could cut a billion from the Atomic Energy Commission's \$1.8 billion budget item to produce new warheads, and 4 billion more from the Army, Navy, and Air Force retaliatory weapons budgets without reducing the Nation's security. On the contrary, he argued in his speech, it would strengthen it by making more money available for public health, education, conservation, and job retraining. He coupled his cuts with a proposal to oblige major defense contractors to set up operating committees to plan for conversion from military to civilian use when cutbacks come. An "arms economy," he said, "has added to our civilian production costs, decreased our efficiency, undercut our competitive position in international trade, and aggravated the balance-of-payments problem."

There is too much logic and good sense in the Senator's idea for it to have easy sliding. Congress, like almost everybody else, is suspicious of new approaches and slow to change. Furthermore even though the long-term prosperity is more promising, this concept would shrink some defense contracts—enough to give some Congressmen apoplexy.

But now, in the fluidity of East-West relations, is the time to explore new approaches to security and take a wide rather than a narrow view. Senator McGovern himself gave such counsel in his maiden Senate speech last March when he wisely warned against a "senseless fixation on Castro" that was blinding us to the problems of the hemisphere. Now we must stretch our horizons to reach the world's problems whereon, McGovern said this afternoon, "both Americans and Russians must make a choice between the quick and the dead."

This is Edward F. Morgan saying good night from Washington.

SOVIET ANTISEMITISM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last month Pennsylvania religious leaders of the major faiths sent through the Soviet Embassy here a strongly worded cablegram to Premier Khrushchev assailing certain indications of anti-Semitism in Russia, and urging the Moscow government "to lift its official policy of oppression against its Jewish citizens." The western Pennsylvania leaders sharply criticized the "blanket restraints" against all religions in the U.S.S.R.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the cablegram and a letter of July 3, 1963, along with the names of the Pennsylvania religious leaders, may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the cablegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Translation of a cable addressed to Chairman Khrushchev on Dec. 7, 1962]

Chairman NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV,
The Kremlin, Moscow, U.S.S.R.:

The Soviet Union declares it is a champion of human dignity and equality. No nation has been more persevering in pronouncing itself a defender of minority rights.

Soviet spokesmen cite your country's Constitution, wherein equality of citizens is guaranteed, as proof that religious discrimination is not countenanced in the U.S.S.R. You yourself have said: "The question of a man's religion is not asked in our country. It is a matter for the conscience of the person concerned. We look upon a person as a person."

But what are the facts?

The Soviet Government's persistent enmity to religion is a matter of historical record. While most faiths are permitted bare necessities, such as requisites for worship, sacred literature, theological seminaries and central bodies, their activities are sternly circumscribed. Devout citizens—Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox—suffer harassment. Nowhere, not even within the walls of church or mosque, is religion secure from surveillance. This is a fact of Soviet life.

It is also a fact that within the narrow framework of permissible religious practice, discrimination is enforced. Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union, numbering close to 3 million, are denied minimal rights.

Hard pressed as they are by blanket restraints, none of the other major religions of the Soviet people, neither the Orthodox, Armenian, Catholic or Protestant Churches, neither Buddhism nor Islam, have been subjected to the extraordinary disabilities inflicted on Judaism and its followers.

Legally constituted Jewish congregations are isolated from one another. They are forbidden to organize a central body. They are allowed no contact with Jewish religious groups in other countries. Their leaders are singled out for abuse.

Since June 1961, synagogue presidents in six cities have been arbitrarily removed from office; Jewish communal leaders in Leningrad and Moscow have been sentenced to prison for the alleged crime of meeting with foreign visitors to their synagogues.

Scores of synagogues have been closed by the state. The few that remain are served by rabbis who were ordained more than 40 years ago. For more than a generation, Jewish theological seminaries have been banned, except for a lone yeshiva in Moscow, opened in 1956. Its enrollment, never permitted to exceed 20, was reduced to 4 in April 1962. No Jewish Bible has been printed in 40 years. No articles for Jewish ritual can be produced. This year, for the first time in Soviet history, even the sale of unleavened bread, essential to observance of the Passover, was banned. The prayers of Judaism are said in Hebrew, yet the teaching of that language is prohibited.

Although half a million Jews declared Yiddish as their mother tongue in the Soviet census of 1959, their hundreds of schools, their once-flourishing theaters have been stamped out. Much smaller ethnic or linguistic groups have schools, theaters, books and newspapers in their own languages.

These conditions conjure up memories of the antisemitic Stalin regime, which you yourself have denounced.

According to the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the constitutions of enlightened countries, freedom of conscience and expression is vested unconditionally in every human being.

Unless the Soviet Government conforms its behavior to this universal standard and

to its own professed principles, it forfeits the confidence of all peoples.

When will synagogues and Jewish seminaries be reestablished, imprisoned synagogue leaders set free, the ban on unleavened bread rescinded, ritual articles and Jewish prayerbooks made available?

When will the Yiddish-language institutions that sustained Soviet Jewish culture and education be restored?

When will Jewish congregations, like those of other religions, be enabled to form a central body, to join in fellowship for the continuity of their faith?

The world awaits your response.

By deeds alone, can your Government confirm that the Soviet Union in truth upholds the rights of minorities and the equal dignity of man.

JULY 3, 1963.

His Excellency ANATOLY F. DOBRININ,
Ambassador of the U.S.S.R.,
Washington, D.C.:

We the undersigned citizens of western Pennsylvania, wish to associate ourselves with the growing protest against the mistreatment of Jews in the Soviet Union. We request an answer to the message to Premier Khrushchev sent by 46 clergymen and other leaders on December 7 urging the Russian Government to lift its official policy of oppression against its Jewish citizens. A copy of the message is being sent under separate cover.

Rev. John Balz, Calvary Episcopal Church; Archbishop Benjamin, Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church; Rev. Lester Bumpus, Executive Secretary, Pittsburgh Baptist Association; Rev. Edward Cahill, First Unitarian Church; Rev. James B. Cayce, Ebenezer Baptist Church; Bishop William G. Gunnare, Diocese of Greensburg; Prof. Robert C. Johnson, professor, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary; Vigdor W. Kavalier, Rodef Shalom Temple Executive Secretary; Rev. Robert Kincheloe, executive director, Council of Churches, Pittsburgh; Rev. N. R. H. Moor, Trinity Cathedral; Rev. Joseph Morledge, Sixth Presbyterian Church; Rev. LeRoy Patrick, Bethesda Presbyterian Church; Rev. Howard C. Scharfe, Shadyside Presbyterian Church; Rev. Frederic Schumann, First Trinity Lutheran Church; Rabbi Frederick C. Schwartz, Rodef Shalom Temple; Bishop John J. Wright, Diocese of Pittsburgh.

THE TIME HAS COME TO SPEAK OUT ON THE PROBLEM OF POPULATION CONTROL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I now speak on the topic "The Time Has Come To Speak Out on the Problem of Population Control."

The time has come to let some light into a room the Congress has kept dark for many years.

The time has come to speak out in the Congress of the United States on the controversial subject of population control.

The time has come for Members of the Congress to give serious study to the writings and speeches of Dr. John Rock, whose book "The Time Has Come" is subtitled "A Catholic Doctors' Proposals To End the Battle over Birth Control."

Dr. Rock, clinical professor (emeritus) of gynecology at Harvard University, is a dedicated Roman Catholic who has made